

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/092,914	03/08/2002	Michihiro Saito	H-1036	1301
24956 75	590 04/07/2005	EXAMINER		
MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C. 1800 DIAGONAL ROAD			HAQ, SHAFIQUL	
SUITE 370	AL RUAD		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			1641	
			DATE MAILED: 04/07/200	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	1 A 11 A1 A1					
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Commence	10/092,914	SAITO ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Shafiqul Haq	1641				
The MAILING DATE of this communicati Period for Reply	on appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communica - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) day - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, be Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	TION. CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a ration. ys, a reply within the statutory minimum of thir y period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON by statute, cause the application to become AE	eply be timely filed by (30) days will be considered timely. ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed or	n					
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b)	☑ This action is non-final.					
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected. 7) ⊠ Claim(s) 2, 4 and 5 is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction.	rithdrawn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Ex	caminer.					
D)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>08 March 2002</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection	• , ,	, ,				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by	•	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for f a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority doc 2. Certified copies of the priority doc 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International I * See the attached detailed Office action for	uments have been received. uments have been received in A ne priority documents have been Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)	_					
1) 🔀 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) 🔲 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-9		Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date				
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-9) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO-Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/26/2002. 		nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 1641

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

- 1. Claims 4-5 are objected to because of the following informalities: a grammatical error: "and" in line 3 of claims 4 and 5 should be --with-- to provide correct meaning of the sentence. Appropriate correction is required.
- 2. Claims 2 is objected to because of the following informalities: "reagent vessel" in line 12 should be "reaction vessel" to provide correct meaning of the sentence.
- 3. Claims 4-5 are objected to as the preamble reads the limitation of the claims and thus needs a transitional phrase "comprising" to separate preamble from the body of the claims.
- Foreign patent document cited in IDS has not been considered because a copy
 of English translation was not supplied.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1, lines 2-3 recites the phrase "plural kinds of liquid reagent". It is not clear what is meant by the phrase. Is it the same reagent or different reagents in different reagent vessels?

Claim 1, line 3 recites the term "fine particles". it is unclear what is meant by this term as "Fine particle" is a general term encompassing different kinds and different sizes of particles and thus renders the claim indefinite.

In Claim 1, Line 5 the phrase "stirring vessel for stirring the liquid reagent" is vague and indefinite as it is unclear whether the stirring vessel performs the stirring/mixing function by itself or it requires a stirring rod. It is noted that a "stirring rod" is specifically required in the specification at page 4, line 16 and page 5, line 24.

Lines 5-8 and 11-12 of claims 1 refers to "the liquid reagent". It is not clear what liquid reagent it is referring to since lines 2-3 of claims 1 recites the phrase "plural kinds of liquid reagent". Clarification is required.

In Claim 1, line 12 the term "the reagent vessel" renders the claim indefinite as it is unclear whether the term "the reagent vessel" encompass one or more of the reagent vessels. It is noted that line 2 of claim I recites the phrase "plural reagent vessels".

The term "stirring time interval" in lines 14-15 of claim 1 is vague and indefinite as it is not clear what is meant by stirring time interval and how it is determined. Specification (page 3, lines 2-7) refers to a Japanese Patent for setting a "standard stirring interval" however the term has not been defined in the specification.

Art Unit: 1641

- Although specific claims may be discussed in the rejections above, these
 rejections are also applicable to all other claims in which the noted
 problems/language occur.
- 7. Claim 2 recites the limitation "the dispensing sequence" in line 11. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
- 8. Claim 3 recites the limitation "the timing of dispensing" in line 11. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- Claims 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by William J. Raymoure (WO 93/20444).

Raymore teaches a method for providing homogeneous reagents using automated analytical system which involves antigen or antibody bonded with fine particles (beads or particles) to determine the presence or amount of an analyte or an antibody present in a test sample (Claims 3-6 and 18). The system comprises the following: reagent vessels for liquid reagents, a reaction vessel for mixing, a probe (transfer pipette) for dispensing liquid reagent (page 28, lines 5-16 and page 22, lines 11-20) and measuring device to measure the reaction

(Page 19, lines 30-37). Raymoure also discloses that the system includes a controlled environment for providing timing of mixing (page 22, lines 18-20) and timing of dispensing (Page 28, lines 12-16) of liquid reagents.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 7. Claims 1-2 and 4-5 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 8. The closest prior art (WO 93/20444) teaches method for providing homogeneous reagent that involves antigen or antibody bonded with fine particles and contains all the elements of the analyzing apparatus of the instant invention as discussed above for claim 3 except that the prior art fails to teach means for determining as to whether or not the liquid reagents in reagent vessels is stirred prior to dispensing based on two information: 1) predetermined stirring time interval and 2) carry-over (contamination) between liquid reagents.

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shafiqul Haq whose telephone number is 571-272-6103. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30AM-4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Long V. Le can be reached on 571-272-0823. The fax

Application/Control Number: 10/092,914

Art Unit: 1641

phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is

assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from

the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information

for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public

PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through

Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-

direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-

free).

Shafiqul Haq

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 1641

LONG V. LE

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600

20/11/20

Page 6